

REMARKS

The present application has been carefully studied and amended in view of the outstanding Office Action dated July 6, 2006, and reconsideration of that Action is respectfully requested.

The specification has been amended to include appropriate subtitles. As amended the specification is believed to be in proper form and well within the appropriate guidelines.

Applicant respectfully traverses the restriction requirement in the present application particularly between the process of claims 1-9 and the molding of claim 10. Both the process and the molding are interrelated and similar issues must be addressed in determining patentability. The fields of search are similar and overlapping, and it is believed that a single prosecution history should be made with respect to the subject matter of claims 1-10. Discretion is allowed in matters of restriction, and it is respectfully requested that such discretion be exercised in favor of dropping the restriction requirement between the process and the article. For the record, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement. However, as required by the Rules, applicant elects the process and finds claims 1-9 readable thereon.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention specifically recited in claims 1-9 is not disclosed or suggested by the prior art, particularly Schweizer US 5,674,414, for the reasons discussed below.

As amended, claim 1 recites ablating those portions of the solid outer skin with conductive particles therein to expose the electrically insulating cellular core where no

conductor tracks are intended to run. Such ablating is accomplished with the aid of a selectively ablating process so as to form a predetermined pattern of electrically non-conducting sections in the cellular core at the treated areas. Additionally, the step of ablating recited in claim 1 produces conductor tracks in the solid outer skin at the untreated areas. These features are expressed in the specification at page 3, lines 6-15 and original claim 1.

The above described limitations distinguish claim 1 and dependent claims 2-9 from the cited and applied Schweizer reference. The Examiner indicated that applicant would do well to incorporate such limitations in the ablating step, and the current amendments to claim 1 now incorporate these limitations in the claims.

Schweizer fails to disclose or suggest the invention of claims 1-9 and instead simply discloses an ablating process. There is no ablating of a solid outer skin with conductive particles therein to expose an electrically insulating cellular core where no conductor tracks are intended to run. Additionally, the ablating of Schweizer does not produce a predetermined pattern of non-electrically sections in a cellular core, and the ablating of Schweizer does not produce conductor tracks in a solid outer skin that includes conductor particles at untreated areas of the ablating process.

Accordingly, for the reasons expressed above it is believed that the claims distinguish over the Schweizer reference, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-9 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By Richard M. Beck

Richard M. Beck

Registration No.: 22,580

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP

1007 North Orange Street

P.O. Box 2207

Wilmington, Delaware 19899

(302) 658-9141

(302) 658-5614 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant